UNIVERSITY CURRICULUM COMMITTEE
2015-16 Meeting #7, November 30, 2015

Present: Tim Prather, Matthew Brehm, Dan Eveleth, Janine Darragh, Patricia Hart, Kerri Vierling, Mark Nielsen, Todd Thorsteinson, Rick Stoddardt, Brianna Larson, Jeanne Stevenson, Don Crowly, and Heather Chermak
Absent: Joe Law, Austin Blacker, Ankah Guria, and Kenton Bird
Others Present: Grace Miller, Rebecca Frost, Jeff Dodge, and Traci Craig

Call to order: A quorum being present, the chair called the meeting to order at 3:30p.m. in the Pitman Cataldo room. Dan welcomed members back from Thanksgiving Break. The minutes of the November 16, 2015 meeting were approved.

New Business:

UCC-16-020 COLLEGE OF LAW

Dan invited Jeff Dodge, Associate Dean of the College of Law, to speak. Jeff introduced the proposed Master’s Degree. He explained that there is a growing demand for graduate-level law programs in the United States for foreign trained lawyers. He explained that the proposed L.L.M. is a nine-month program; students would arrive in August and finish in May. The cited proposal includes four emphasis tracks: a general introduction to American law, Natural Resources and Environmental Law, Business Law & Entrepreneurship, and Litigation and Alternative Dispute Resolution. Tim Prather asked if the L.L.M. would impose budgetary constraints and Jeff identified the following costs associated with the proposal: new print materials, on-site international recruitment, and maintaining two new courses. He explained that the University stands to make “quite a bit more money” than it will be spending and once the program grows to 10 people per year, revenue increases significantly.

Dan asked if all students in the program would be foreign-trained lawyers, as the new course descriptions specified. Jeff explained that the program is designed for students who have already earned a Bachelor of Law Degree in other countries, as American lawyers are only expected to complete a J.D., whereas lawyers outside the United States generally pursue L.L.M. degrees in addition to undergraduate-level law degrees. He noted that some domestic students could potentially pursue an L.L.M., but they would not be the focus of the Law School’s marketing efforts. He also noted that international students pursuing the proposed L.L.M. would enter the country with F1 visas. Dan then asked if it were possible for students who are not foreign-trained lawyers to take the two new courses and Jeff responded that these courses are required in the General Introduction emphasis because students from civil law countries often seek introductions to case law and the Socratic methods that characterize the American legal system. Dan asked if there were an internal waiver process and Jeff affirmed, but clarified that American-trained, ESL students are not the program’s focus.

Jeff noted that he ensured the program is in-line with the College Graduate System requirements. Don noted that the University had “somewhat better luck” with the American Language and Culture Program. Jeff responded that the Law School will not do conditional admits.

Dan asked how grading worked. Jeff responded that grading is both challenging and interesting, from an intercultural perspective, as there is a certain level of linguistic bias that may impact international students negatively. He explained that ESL students might not have the same implicit familiarity with common law that American-born, American-trained citizens might, so we can’t assume that students aren’t learning the material simply because they can’t articulate it back to us the way we expect American-born students to. He concluded that the grading system will go unchanged—J.D. and L.L.M. students will be graded separately and anonymously.

Dan noted that there is a credit discrepancy between the Law 857 course proposal and the 857 listing in the curricular proposal. Jeff clarified that it ought to be a 3 credit course. It was moved and seconded to approve the two new Law courses. The motion passed unanimously.
Time noted that the title of the degree itself does not make it clear that it is directed toward international students. He asked if other institutions with L.L.M. degrees were designated the same way, and Jeff affirmed. He explained that, in general, American L.L.M. degrees are geared toward international students. Tim asked what would prevent domestic students from seeking admission to the UI L.L.M. program and Jeff responded that most American law students are aware of this division.

Dan asked how the credits are divvied up and Jeff explained that he will approve curriculum plans for first semester and second semester L.L.M. students, the same way he currently approves plans for second and third year J.D. students. Matthew Brehm asked if ABA had acquiesced and Jeff responded that the proposal is on January’s agenda. It was moved and seconded to approve the new Master of Law program. The motion passed unanimously.

Dan explained that these programs are already being offered by the university. Heather explained that what CLASS is putting forward are programs that they want to offer online in addition to being offered on-location in Moscow. She explained that “not all states play the same way,” but Idaho participates in SARA (State Authorization Reciprocity Agreements), which allows it to share students in online programs with other SARA states. She explained that the University of Idaho can still offer these programs face-to-face, and for many of them the University probably will, but these changes bring our curriculum in-line with SARA requirements. Heather went on to explain that these proposals are in their infancy and the University administration will eventually need to determine how to support students, handle petitions, etc. Dan noted that one of the proposals includes an advisor and the University is still working to build the infrastructure for this kind of support. Heather said: “I don’t know the answers to all of those questions (...) but it’s a conversation that’s going on.” Dan noted that if the committee approves these proposals—even just one—it sends the message “you’re on your own.” Heather responded that they are a little behind, and “Traci [Craig] warned me that these were coming, but I didn’t know when.

Dan asked whether there were advisors available for the CLASS distance courses and Traci Craig explained that these programs already exist, as the courses already exist online, which means that there are already advisors in place. She went on to say that the benefit of the proposed programs is that the undergraduate programs are not exclusively online; the College isn’t proposing a different set of courses for distance students versus in-person students, which will enable a fairly seamless transition.

Dan asked for questions for discussing each program proposal. Patricia asked whether there are other supporting pieces necessary in order to offer these courses, in addition to advisors. Heather responded that there has yet to be full discussion about certain supports, like tutoring and academic support. Traci identified INTR 101 as a source of academic support; it is a course designed for students with academic challenges, available online. It offers a recruiter, online advising, and backup for all unites. She also identified the career liaison model, which offers equipment for Skype interviews and opportunities to build resumes.

Dan asked if all colleges going online are going to replicate this system and Traci responded that, in terms of advising, centralized advising at the University level is probably not advisable. She explained that there is very little connection for online students requesting letters of recommendation. Instead, she said, it is better to get students attached to people in the college. This offers more one-on-one contact, which central advising would not. However, the things they need to provide to students “scale up quite easily.”

Patricia asked how the University would support faculty. Traci explained that the Division of Distance and Extended Education provides services University-wide that faculty members could utilize. Rick noted that CLASS has met with the library regarding an embedded librarian for these courses, in order to provide greater materials access to distance students. He also noted that there is not currently an infrastructure in place for certain distance
necessities, like video streaming and online special collections. In a way, he said, providing digital access to
collections is a matter of “rebuilding the collection all over again.” Rick expressed gladness that the proposal
included some money to support the additional library support.

Tim asked about capital outlay: $600 per course for the library. Rick noted that he understood that to go toward
the embedded librarian. Traci responded that 3 credits per course is the assumption, but that might be “a little
high.”

UCC-16-022a COLLEGE OF LETTERS, ARTS AND SOCIAL SCIENCES: GENERAL STUDIES

Dan directed the committee to the General Studies online degree. He explained that the proposal includes no new
faculty and no new courses. He asked whether online offerings could affect current, in-person courses because
students may choose not to attend in-person. Traci explained that students inclined to do that would likely not
attend at Moscow in the first place. Todd clarified that the question says “affect enrollment in other programs”
and Dan agreed—these online offerings wouldn’t “steal” from other programs.

Tim asked for a clarification regarding the language “stop-out” on page nine, number 16. Traci responded that
“stop it” is the politically correct term for leaving school because it suggests that the student is merely pausing
their education instead of leaving entirely.

Matthew noted that the potential program duplications on page 3 are identified, but there is no rationale
included. Traci explained that the programs exist concurrently, but the other programs are not offered online. It
was moved and seconded to approve the General Studies online degree. The motion passed unanimously.

UCC-16-022b COLLEGE OF LETTERS, ARTS AND SOCIAL SCIENCES: SOCIOLOGY

The committee moved to discuss the online Sociology: Criminology degree. Dan noted that the proposal requires
additional faculty. Rick asked for clarification regarding the $2,000 included for the library and Traci explained that
it is a flat fee, instead of a per-course.

Dan asked for additional details regarding the program’s revenue. Traci explained that there is a memo going
through the office with information as to how revenue will fund the program. She further explained that this
information relies on projections. Tim noted that the entire program could collapse if the MOU isn’t signed. Dan
noted that the committee is being asked to approve something that is far from complete. Tim asked for a timeline
and Traci responded that she assumed the MOU is at the Provost’s Office. She noted that the MOU would certainly
appear before the State Board meeting and CAP. Tim asked if it would be wise to table the Sociology: Criminology
degree, barring further information about the MOU. He suggested that tabling might speed up the signing process.

Patricia asked if the committee ever held up approvals if the proposal includes a new hire. She asked if the
committee could approve the proposal with contingencies, and Dan said: “who’s going to stop us?” Todd noted his
support for passing the proposal and his hope that the Psych department receives the additional support. He also
noted that the Psych department has already committed to delivering these courses, as they are already available
online. Dan asked what would happen to in-person students if the Psych department didn’t receive the funds cited
in the proposal and Todd responded that the department prioritizes distance students. Todd noted: “I’d just rather
have greater capacity.”

Dan asked what the process is for the MOU and Traci responded that it has to go through all the people listed in
the proposal’s signature lines. She said that she imagined it is in the Budget Director’s Office. Dan suggested that
the committee might hold some proposals back in order to provide leverage to the MOU. He said that the
committee might also “approve them and use the strategy of hope.” Dan and Tim both noted that approving the
course with a contingency would make it clear that they are paying attention. Patricia noted that it is necessary to
approve the program before hiring any faculty and suggested that the committee approve the proposals in order
to compel the MOU forward. It was moved and seconded to approve the Sociology: Criminology online degree. The motion passed unanimously, contingent upon the MOU being signed.

UCC-16-022c COLLEGE OF LETTERS, ARTS AND SOCIAL SCIENCES: HISTORY

It was moved and seconded to approve the online History degree. The motion passed unanimously, with no contingencies.

UCC-16-022d COLLEGE OF LETTERS, ARTS AND SOCIAL SCIENCES: ORGANIZATIONAL SCIENCE

It was moved and seconded to approve the online Organizational Science degree. Dan asked for thoughts and Rick noted that this proposal does not include a piece about library resources in the narrative. Traci responded that library resources are identified in the budget. The motion passed unanimously, with no contingencies.

UCC-16-022e COLLEGE OF LETTERS, ARTS AND SOCIAL SCIENCES: PSYCHOLOGY

Todd noted that this proposal included requests for two full-time faculty, on part-time advisor, and an increased TA budget, in addition to library resources and marketing materials. Tim said that this proposal also requires a contingency, for the sake of consistency. Traci clarified that new courses are being added, which makes it different from the Sociology: Criminology degree. It was moved and seconded to approve the Psychology online degree. The motion passed unanimously, with no contingencies.

UCC-16-022f COLLEGE OF LETTERS, ARTS AND SOCIAL SCIENCES: MASTERS OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

Dan noted that this proposal includes a different kind of fee. Traci explained that this is an extension of a current program, newly envisioned to provide a professional MPA degree. She explained that the people seeking this degree are already working in government positions. She noted that the Dean and Chair set the price-point to match the market for this kind of professional program and some people may receive funding from their employers, which is why the proposal includes a separate fee. Traci noted that this proposal is also MOU contingent.

Dan asked if students could move back and forth between the programs and Traci responded that it isn’t likely, given the programs’ layout and periodicity. She noted that it was possible, in terms of curriculum, so long as the department is willing to work with the students who leave the physical program and try to enter the online program.

Heather said that they would clarify that this is a professional degree, not a thesis-type degree. She noted that the Registrar’s Office would require difference major codes. Dan asked if students in different programs would be enrolled in the same courses and whether it is fair to charge students disparate fees. Don noted that people would likely be willing to pay different fees in order to take in-person courses instead of distance courses. He also noted that this isn’t a new dilemma. Rick asked whether the $600 per course fee is meant to apply to the online MPA and Traci responded that the email she saw did not specify. She noted that she would take it back to the college. It was moved and seconded to approve the online MPA program. The motion passed unanimously, with no contingency.

Jeanne thanked Traci for her support and noted that these programs are a work in progress. Dan noted that “creating new vandals” around the state by helping people finish their degrees would help the University gain access to an “untapped market.”

UCC-16-023 COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURAL AND LIFE SCIENCES

Tim noted that the only difference between this form and the documents at CCC is the listed financial impact. The CCC forms listed the impact at $100,000 per year. The UCC form listed no impact. Tim explained that the department division was highly controversial, as departments lost resources during the change. In reference to the form submitted to UCC, Mark noted that there is no financial impact related to the changing of the name, “which is
“carefully worded and correct.” Mark said that funding is beyond the scope of this committee. Matthew noted that this change is more than a name change; it implicates a new administration. Dan suggested that the committee request information and Don noted that the same questions will likely come back up in the Senate. Dan suggested that the committee attempt to mitigate the Senate’s acrimony. He suggested that the committee table the proposal and invite Larry Makus to speak to it next week.

The next UCC meeting will be December 7, 2015. This meeting was adjourned at 5:00 PM.

Grace Miller, UCC Secretary